



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

*308*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,645	10/19/2000	Edward M. House	MBHB00-591	8278

20306 7590 12/06/2001

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF  
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE  
SUITE 3200  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

POON, KING Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2001

*4*

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/692,645

Applicant(s)

Edward M. Housel

Examiner

King Y. Poon

Art Unit

2624



- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:

- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

DOV POPOVICI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 2 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2624

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,822,506) in view of Ikegaya et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,263,129) and Matysek et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,442,732)

Regarding claims 1, and 5: Chen et al. teach a method of performing setup operations (column 3, lines 1-10, column 4, line 29) on a finishing device (20, 22, column 3, lines 1-10, fig. 1) connected to an electrophotographic printer, (10, fig. 1) the printer comprising the steps of: a) entering a print job (column 3, lines 17-40) into the printer, the print job including setup instructions (fig. 2, column 2, lines 38-41, column 4, lines 8-35) for at least one finishing device (20, 22, fig. 1) written as an operator message; (column 4, lines 4-25) b) automatically supplying setup operations to be performed prior to completing the print job; (column 4, lines 10-20) c) automatically placing all pending print jobs on hold that specify the finishing device; (column 4, lines 20-25, 29, fig. 2); d) performing the setup operations according to supplied instruction; (column 4, lines 29-32); and e) entering a release code (the program code that control the

Art Unit: 2624

branching from 44 to 42, fig. 2) to thereby release the print job from hold and allow the printer to complete the print job (column 3, lines 23-25)

Chen et al. do not teach printing an instruction sheet listing setup operations.

Ikegaya, in the same area of user modifying printing devices, (column 1, lines 30-55), teaches printing an instruction sheet listing setup operations instructing users of how to setup the printing device. (column 8, lines 5-15)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. by: printing an instruction sheet listing setup operations.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. by the teaching of Ikegaya because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed a user to setup various functions very easily and in a short time; as taught by Ikegaya, at column 8, lines 15-20; (b) it would allow users to avoid alternately looking at a manual to an operation panel for setting up the devices; as taught by Ikegaya, at column 1, lines 45-50; and (c) a printed instruction sheet is more easily to carry compare to a display monitor displaying the instructions.

Chen et al. as modified by Ikegaya still do not teach a printer user interface.

Matysek teaches a printer (8, fig. 1) having a printer user interface (62, 52, 64, and 66, fig. 1).

Art Unit: 2624

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. as modified by Ikegaya by: providing the printer with a printer user interface.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. as modified by Ikegaya by the teaching of Matysek because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed users to control the printer at the location of the printer; and (b) it would have allowed users to set up job parameters such as the quantity of prints, and finishing selections, as taught by Matysek at column 1, lines 10-25.

3. Claims 9, 13, 17 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,822,506) in view of Ikegaya et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,263,129)

Regarding claims 9 and 13: Chen et al. teach a method of managing a printer system, (fig. 1) comprising the steps of: a. receiving a print job; (29, fig. 2); b. determining whether the print job specifies a finishing device (20, 22, column 3, lines 5-15) and whether the print job includes instructions directing an operator (column 4, lines 8-35, 40, fig. 2) to perform specific setup operations and, if so, placing on hold all print jobs that specify the finishing device; (column 4, lines 20-25, 29 of fig. 2); c. performing the setup operations sheet; (column 4, lines 29-32) and d. entering a code that removes the hold, allowing the print jobs to proceed (the program code that control the branching from 44 to 42, fig. 2).

Art Unit: 2624

Chen et al. do not teach printing an instruction sheet listing setup operations to be performed by the operator.

Ikegaya, in the same area of user modifying printing devices, (column 1, lines 30-55), teaches printing an instruction sheet listing setup operations instructing users of how to setup the printing device (column 8, lines 5-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. by: printing an instruction sheet listing setup operations to be performed by the operator.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. by the teaching of Ikegaya because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed a user to setup various functions very easily and in a short time; as taught by Ikegaya, at column 8, lines 15-20; (b) it would allow users to avoid alternately looking at a manual to an operation panel for setting up the devices; as taught by Ikegaya, at column 1, lines 45-50; and (c) a printed instruction sheet is more easily to carry compare to a display monitor displaying the instructions.

Regarding claim 17: Chen et al. teach a method of managing a printer system, fig. 1) comprising the steps of: a. setting up a print job (fig. 2) using a setup menu that includes an instruction field in which operator setup instructions may be entered; (column 4, lines 10-20) b. submitting the print job to the printer; (28, fig. 2) c. determining whether any text (setup instruction, column 4, line 10-24) has been entered in the instruction field and, (column 4, lines

Art Unit: 2624

25-32) if so, placing all print jobs on hold; (print job is hold on 29, fig. 2, before post processor is being set up in 44, fig. 2) d. performing one or more setup operations; (44, fig. 2) and e. entering a code that removes the hold, allowing the print jobs to proceed (the program code that control the branching from 44 to 42, fig. 2).

Chen et al. do not teach printing an instruction sheet comprising the text (setup instruction) entered in the operator instruction field.

Ikegaya, in the same area of user modifying printing devices, (column 1, lines 30-55), teaches printing an instruction sheet listing setup operations instructing users of how to setup the printing device (column 8, lines 5-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. by: printing an instruction sheet comprising the text (setup instruction) entered in the operator instruction field.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. by the teaching of Ikegaya because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed a user to setup various functions very easily and in a short time; as taught by Ikegaya, at column 8, lines 15-20; (b) it would allow users to avoid alternately looking at a manual to an operation panel for setting up the devices; as taught by Ikegaya, at column 1, lines 45-50; and (c) a printed instruction sheet is more easily to carry compare to a display monitor displaying the instructions.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 21. Chen et al teach a method of managing a printer system, (fig. 2) comprising the steps of: a. receiving a print job; (29, fig. 2) b. determining that the print job includes operator instructions; (40, fig. 2) c. automatically placing the print job on hold (print job is not passing 44 before post processor is being set up) while allowing other print jobs to continue; (other job is stored in 29, fig. 2) d. performing operations specified by the operator instructions; (44, fig. 2) and e. entering a code that removes the hold, allowing the print job to proceed (the program code that control the branching from 44 to 42, fig. 2).

Chen et al. do not teach printing an instruction sheet corresponding to the operator instructions.

Ikegaya, in the same area of user modifying printing devices, (column 1, lines 30-55), teaches printing an instruction sheet listing setup operations instructing users of how to setup the printing device (column 8, lines 5-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. by: printing an instruction sheet corresponding to the operator instructions;

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. by the teaching of Ikegaya because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed a user to setup various functions very easily and in a short time; as taught by Ikegaya, at column 8, lines 15-20; (b) it would allow users to avoid alternately looking at a manual to an operation panel for setting up the devices; as taught by



Art Unit: 2624

Ikegaya, at column 1, lines 45-50; and (c) a printed instruction sheet is more easily to carry compare to a display monitor displaying the instructions.

4. Claims 3, 4, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,822,506) in view of Ikegaya et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,263,129) and Matysek et al. as applied to claims 1, 5, above, and further in view of Yamada (U.S. Patent # 5,798,738).

Regarding claims 3, and 7: Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. and Matysek do not teach wherein the print job is entered through a network.

Yamada teaches to enter print jobs (column 5, lines 60-61, column 14, line 2) to a printer (server MFP, column 5, lines 60-61, column 3, lines 60-61) through a network (column 3, line 51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. and Matysek by entering the print job through a network.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. and Matysek by the teaching of Yamada because of the following reasons (a) it would have allowed users to send print jobs to remote printers, and thereby allowing users to communicate in far apart distances; (b) it would have allowed users to send print jobs to different printers; and (c) it would have allowed users to print the print jobs with other printers while a printer is down in the network.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claims 4, and 8: Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. and Matysek do not teach wherein the printer is a stand-alone unit including a scanner that provides image data to the printer.

Yamada teaches a printer which is a stand-alone unit including a scanner that provides image data to the printer (fig. 13 A, column 4, lines 15-25, column 5, line 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. and Matysek by replacing the printer with a printer which is a stand-alone unit including a scanner that provides image data to the printer.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. and Matysek by the teaching of Yamada because of the following reasons (a) it would have allowed the printer to scan images for uses; (b) adding scanning functions to the printer would have provided addition functions to be used by users and thereby, increase the usability of the printing system.

5. Claims 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,822,506) in view of Ikegaya et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,263,129) as applied to claims 9, 13, 17, and 21 above, and further in view of Yamada (U.S. Patent # 5,798,738).

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claims 12, 16, 20, and 23: Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. do not teach wherein the printer is a stand-alone unit including a scanner that provides image data to the printer.

Yamada teaches a printer which is a stand-alone unit including a scanner that provides image data to the printer (fig. 13 A, column 4, lines 15-25, column 5, line 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. by replacing the printer with a printer which is a stand-alone unit including a scanner that provides image data to the printer.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. by the teaching of Yamada because of the following reasons (a) it would have allowed the printer to scan images for uses; (b) adding scanning functions to the printer would have provided addition functions to be used by users and thereby, increase the usability of the printing system.

Regarding claims 11, and 15: Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. do not teach wherein the print job is received from a network.

Yamada teaches to receive print jobs (column 5, lines 60-61, column 14, line 2) by a printer (server MFP, column 5, lines 60-61, column 3, lines 60-61) through a network (column 3, line 51).

Art Unit: 2624

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. by receiving the print job through a network.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. by the teaching of Yamada because of the following reasons (a) it would have allowed users to print print jobs using remote printers, and thereby allowing users to communicate in far apart distances; (b) it would have allowed users to print print jobs to different printers; and (c) it would have allowed users to print print jobs with other printers while a printer is down in the network.

Regarding claims 19 and 24: Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. do not teach wherein the print job is set up on a network.

Yamada teaches to set up print jobs (column 5, lines 60-61, column 14, line 2) to be printed by a printer (server MFP, column 5, lines 60-61, column 3, lines 60-61) through a network (column 3, line 51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. by setting up the print job on a network.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. in view of Ikegaya et al. by the teaching of Yamada because of the following reasons (a) it would have allowed users to print print jobs

Art Unit: 2624

using remote printers, and thereby allowing users to communicate in far apart distances; (b) it would have allowed users to print print jobs to different printers; and (c) it would have allowed users to print print jobs with other printers while a printer is down in the network.

6. Claims 10, 14, 18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,822,506) in view of Ikegaya et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,263,129) as applied to claims 9, 13, 17, and 21 above, and further in view of Olarig (U.S. Patent # 5,878,237).

Regarding claims 10, 14, 18, and 22: Chen et al. do not teach wherein at least some of the instructions for setup operations are stored on a memory.

Ikegaya teaches to store the setup instructions in a memory (column 3, lines 1-10)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. by: storing the setup instructions in a memory

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al. by the teaching of Ikegaya because of the following reasons: (a) storing the setup instruction by a memory would have prevented the setup instruction being lost, and users would save time for not having to write the setup instruction every time the system is to be setup.

Chen et al as modified by Ikegaya still do not teach storing the instructions in a local disk.

Art Unit: 2624

Olarig teaches to use a local disk as a memory for storing information (column 15, lines 15-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al as modified by Ikegaya by: replacing the memory used to store the setup instruction by a local disk.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al as modified by Ikegaya by the teaching of Olarig because of the following reasons: (a) a hard disk would have allowed the printer system to save data from losing even when the power to the system is being turned off; and (b) a hard disk is more durable compared to a tape of a floppy disk, and thereby, allowing the system to last longer.

7. Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,822,506) in view of Ikegaya et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,263,129) and Matysek et al. as applied to claims 1, and 5 above, and further in view of Campbell, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 5,172,326) and Ng (U.S. Patent # 5,455,681).

Regarding claims 2 and 6: Chen et al in view of Ikegaya et al. and Matysek teach to create instruction for a specified finishing device (44, fig. 2).

Chen et al in view of Ikegaya et al. and Matysek do not teach: a. accessing a database of setup instructions that are to be performed on the at least one finishing device; b. retrieving a file from the database containing instructions for a specified finishing device; and c. reading the file.

Art Unit: 2624

Campbell, Jr. et al., teach accessing a database (37, fig. 5) of instructions; (36, fig. 5); b. retrieving a file (column 17, lines 25-30) from the database containing instructions; and c. reading the file (column 17, lines 25-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al in view of Ikegaya et al. and Matysek by: a. accessing a database of setup instructions that are to be performed on the at least one finishing device; b. retrieving a file from the database containing instructions for a specified finishing device; and c. reading the file.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al in view of Ikegaya et al. and Matysek by the teaching of Campbell, Jr. et al. because of the following reasons: (a) a data base would have provided a bigger memory for storing the setup instructions, and (b) storing the setup instruction by a data base would have prevented the setup instruction being lost, and users would save time for not having to write the setup instruction every time the system is to be setup.

Chen et al in view of Ikegaya et al. and Matysek as modified by Campbell, Jr. et al. do not teach translating the file into a page description file that is rasterized and incorporated into the printed instruction sheet.

Ng translating a file (fig. 1, text file, column 2, lines 40-50) into a page description file (Postscript file, fig. 1) that is rasterized to be printed (column 5, lines 30-45).

Art Unit: 2624


Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al in view of Ikegaya et al. and Matysek as modified by Campbell, Jr. et al. by: translating the file into a page description file that is rasterized and incorporated into the printed instruction sheet.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen et al in view of Ikegaya et al. and Matysek as modified by Campbell, Jr. et al. by the teaching of Ng because of the following reasons: (a) page description file would contain less data to be transmitted compare to bitmap file and would have conserve network bandwidth when transmitting page description file instead of bitmap file; and (b) it would have speed up data transmitting because page description file has less data compare to bitmap file; (c) Page description file is a compressed file and would require less memory to store the file in the printer, thereby, reducing memory requirments of the printer.

*Conclusion*

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is (703) 305-0892

December 3, 2001

  
DOV POPOVICI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER